	Case 1:07-cr-00019	Filed 09/12/2007 Page 1 of 36
		FILED
1		Clerk District Count
2	IN THE UNITED ST.	ATES DISTRICT COURT SEP 1 2 2007
3	FC	OR THE
4	NORTHERN M	IARIANA ISLANDS For The Northern Mariana Islandi (Deputy Clerk)
5	10 4000	fashed aidid
6	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, )	
7	Plaintiff,	CRIMINAL CASE NO. 07-00019
8	)	
9	-v- )	JURY INSTRUCTIONS
10	SAMUEL RAYBURN,	
11	Defendant.	
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22	Dated this <u>/2</u> day of Septem	ber, 2007.
23		
24		
25		JUDGE, ALEX R. MUNSON
26		JUDGE, ALEX R. MUNSON

AO 72 (Rev. 08/82)

#### 1. FUNCTION OF JURY

MEMBERS OF THE JURY, NOW THAT YOU HAVE HEARD ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, IT IS MY DUTY TO INSTRUCT YOU ON THE LAW WHICH APPLIES TO THIS CASE. A COPY OF THESE INSTRUCTIONS WILL BE AVAILABLE IN THE JURY ROOM FOR YOU TO CONSULT.

THE CASE. TO THOSE FACTS, YOU WILL APPLY THE LAW AS I GIVE IT TO YOU. YOU MUST FOLLOW THE LAW AS I GIVE IT TO YOU WHETHER YOU AGREE WITH IT OR NOT. YOU MUST NOT BE INFLUENCED BY ANY PERSONAL LIKES OR DISLIKES, OPINIONS, PREJUDICES, OR SYMPATHIES. THAT MEANS THAT YOU MUST DECIDE THE CASE SOLELY ON THE EVIDENCE BEFORE YOU. YOU WILL RECALL THAT YOU TOOK AN OATH PROMISING TO DO SO AT THE BEGINNING OF THE CASE.

IN FOLLOWING MY INSTRUCTIONS, YOU MUST FOLLOW ALL OF THEM,
AND NOT SINGLE OUT SOME AND IGNORE OTHERS; THEY ARE ALL EQUALLY
IMPORTANT. YOU MUST NOT READ INTO THESE INSTRUCTIONS, OR INTO
ANYTHING THE COURT MAY HAVE SAID OR DONE, ANY SUGGESTION AS TO
WHAT VERDICT YOU SHOULD RETURN -- THAT IS A MATTER ENTIRELY UP TO
YOU.

#### 2. THE UNITED STATES AS A PARTY

YOU ARE TO PERFORM THE DUTY OF FINDING THE FACTS WITHOUT BIAS OR PREJUDICE AS TO ANY PARTY. YOU ARE TO PERFORM YOUR FINAL DUTY IN AN ATTITUDE OF COMPLETE FAIRNESS AND IMPARTIALITY. THE CASE IS IMPORTANT TO THE GOVERNMENT BECAUSE THE ENFORCEMENT OF CRIMINAL LAWS IS A MATTER OF PRIME IMPORTANCE TO THE COMMUNITY. EQUALLY, IT IS IMPORTANT TO THE DEFENDANT WHO IS CHARGED WITH SERIOUS CRIMES. THE FACT THAT THE PROSECUTION IS BROUGHT IN THE NAME OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA ENTITLES THE GOVERNMENT TO NO GREATER CONSIDERATION THAN THAT ACCORDED TO ANY OTHER PARTY TO A CASE. BY THE SAME TOKEN, IT IS ENTITLED TO NO LESS CONSIDERATION. ALL PARTIES, WHETHER THE GOVERNMENT OR INDIVIDUALS, STAND AS EQUALS AT THE BAR OF JUSTICE.

#### 3. <u>INDICTMENT IS NOT EVIDENCE</u>

THE INDICTMENT IS NOT EVIDENCE. THE DEFENDANT HAS PLEADED NOT GUILTY TO THE CHARGE. THE DEFENDANT IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT AND DOES NOT HAVE TO TESTIFY OR PRESENT ANY EVIDENCE TO PROVE HIS INNOCENCE. THE GOVERNMENT HAS THE BURDEN OF PROVING EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CHARGES BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

# 4. RIGHT NOT TO TESTIFY

A DEFENDANT IN A CRIMINAL CASE HAS A CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT
NOT TO TESTIFY. NO PRESUMPTION OF GUILT MAY BE RAISED, AND NO
INFERENCE OF ANY KIND MAY BE DRAWN, FROM THE FACT THAT THE
DEFENDANT DID NOT TESTIFY.

## 5. PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE

AS I TOLD YOU AT THE OUTSET OF THE TRIAL, THIS IS A CRIMINAL CASE IN WHICH THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED WITH VIOLATING CERTAIN LAWS OF THE UNITED STATES. THE CHARGES, HOWEVER, ARE ONLY ALLEGATIONS. THE DEFENDANT IS PRESUMED TO BE INNOCENT OF THOSE CHARGES UNLESS AND UNTIL YOU, THE JURY, FIND BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT DEFENDANT IS GUILTY OF ANY OFFENSE ALLEGED IN THE INDICTMENT.

#### 6. <u>BURDEN OF PROOF</u>

IN A CRIMINAL CASE, THE GOVERNMENT ALWAYS HAS THE BURDEN OF PROOF. TO OVERCOME THE PRESUMPTION OF INNOCENCE AND PROVE THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF AN OFFENSE, THE GOVERNMENT MUST PROVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT EACH AND EVERY ELEMENT OF THAT OFFENSE AS CHARGED IN THE INDICTMENT.

#### 7. REASONABLE DOUBT

PROOF BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT IS PROOF THAT LEAVES YOU
FIRMLY CONVINCED THAT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY. IT IS NOT REQUIRED
THAT THE GOVERNMENT PROVE GUILT BEYOND ALL POSSIBLE DOUBT.

A REASONABLE DOUBT IS A DOUBT BASED UPON REASON AND
COMMON SENSE AND IS NOT BASED PURELY ON SPECULATION. IT MAY ARISE
FROM A CAREFUL AND IMPARTIAL CONSIDERATION OF ALL THE EVIDENCE,
OR FROM A LACK OF EVIDENCE.

IF, AFTER A CAREFUL AND IMPARTIAL CONSIDERATION OF ALL THE EVIDENCE, YOU ARE NOT CONVINCED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY, IT IS YOUR DUTY TO FIND THE DEFENDANT NOT GUILTY. ON THE OTHER HAND, IF AFTER A CAREFUL AND IMPARTIAL CONSIDERATION OF ALL THE EVIDENCE, YOU ARE CONVINCED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT IS GUILTY, IT IS YOUR DUTY TO FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY.

1	8. EVIDENCE: WHAT IS EVIDENCE				
2	THE EVIDENCE FROM WHICH YOU ARE TO DECIDE THE FACTS OF TH				
3	CASE	ARE:			
5		1.	THE SWORN TESTIMONY OF ANY WITNESS;		
6		2.	THE EXHIBITS WHICH HAVE BEEN RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE;		
7		3.	ANY FACTS TO WHICH THE LAWYERS HAVE STIPULATED; AND		
8		4.	ANY FACTS OF WHICH THE COURT HAS TAKEN JUDICIAL NOTICE.		
9					
10					
11 12					
13					
14					
15					
16					
17					
18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					
24					
25 26					
27					
28					

# 9. EVIDENCE: WHAT IS NOT EVIDENCE

IN REACHING YOUR VERDICT, YOU MAY CONSIDER ONLY THE
EVIDENCE THAT THE COURT HAS RECEIVED, THAT IS, THE TESTIMONY,
EXHIBITS, AND ANY STIPULATIONS. CERTAIN THINGS, HOWEVER, ARE NOT
EVIDENCE AND YOU MAY NOT CONSIDER THEM IN DECIDING THE FACTS. I
WILL LIST THEM FOR YOU:

- 1. ARGUMENTS AND STATEMENTS BY LAWYERS ARE NOT
  EVIDENCE. THE LAWYERS ARE NOT WITNESSES. WHAT THEY SAY IN THEIR
  OPENING OR CLOSING STATEMENTS, AND AT OTHER TIMES IS INTENDED TO
  HELP YOU INTERPRET THE EVIDENCE, BUT IT IS NOT EVIDENCE. IF THE
  FACTS AS YOU REMEMBER THEM DIFFER FROM THE WAY THE LAWYERS
  STATE THEM, YOUR MEMORY OF THEM CONTROLS.
- 2. QUESTIONS AND OBJECTIONS BY LAWYERS ARE NOT EVIDENCE. ATTORNEYS HAVE A DUTY TO THEIR CLIENTS TO OBJECT WHEN THEY BELIEVE A QUESTION IS IMPROPER UNDER THE RULES OF EVIDENCE. YOU SHOULD NOT BE INFLUENCED BY THE QUESTION, THE OBJECTION, OR THE COURT'S RULING ON IT.
- 3. TESTIMONY THAT HAS BEEN EXCLUDED OR STRICKEN, OR
  THAT YOU HAVE BEEN INSTRUCTED TO DISREGARD, IS NOT EVIDENCE AND
  MUST NOT BE CONSIDERED. IN ADDITION, SOME TESTIMONY AND EXHIBITS
  HAVE BEEN RECEIVED ONLY FOR A LIMITED PURPOSE; WHERE I HAVE
  GIVEN A LIMITING INSTRUCTION, YOU MUST FOLLOW IT.

4. ANYTHING YOU MAY HAVE SEEN OR HEARD WHEN THE COURT WAS NOT IN SESSION IS NOT EVIDENCE. YOU ARE TO DECIDE THE CASE SOLELY ON THE EVIDENCE RECEIVED AT THE TRIAL.

10. EVIDENCE: DIRECT AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL

THERE ARE TWO KINDS OF EVIDENCE, DIRECT AND CIRCUMSTANTIAL.

DIRECT EVIDENCE IS DIRECT PROOF OF A FACT, SUCH AS TESTIMONY OF AN EYEWITNESS. CIRCUMSTANTIAL EVIDENCE IS INDIRECT EVIDENCE, THAT IS, PROOF OF A CHAIN OF FACTS FROM WHICH YOU COULD FIND THAT ANOTHER FACT EXISTS, EVEN THOUGH IT HAS NOT BEEN PROVED DIRECTLY. YOU ARE TO CONSIDER BOTH KINDS OF EVIDENCE. THE LAW PERMITS YOU TO GIVE EQUAL WEIGHT TO BOTH, BUT IT IS FOR YOU TO DECIDE HOW MUCH WEIGHT TO GIVE TO ANY EVIDENCE.

26

27

# 12. EVIDENCE: PRIOR INCONSISTENT STATEMENTS

YOU HAVE HEARD EVIDENCE THAT CERTAIN WITNESSES GAVE OR
MADE PRIOR STATEMENTS WHICH MAY HAVE BEEN INCONSISTENT WITH
TESTIMONY GIVEN DURING TRIAL. YOU MAY CONSIDER THIS EVIDENCE,
ALONG WITH OTHER EVIDENCE YOU FIND PERTINENT, IN DECIDING
WHETHER OR NOT TO BELIEVE THE WITNESS AND HOW MUCH WEIGHT TO
GIVE THE TESTIMONY OF THAT WITNESS.

	Case 1:07-cr-00019	Document 45	Filed 09/12/2007	Page 15 of 3
--	--------------------	-------------	------------------	--------------

13.			BY DEFENDANT
II 1 4	H VIII H NE H		RV III HHINDAINI
II I J.	L'IDENCE.	DIALLMILLIO	DI DELEMBANI

YOU HAVE HEARD TESTIMONY THAT THE DEFENDANT MADE CERTAIN
STATEMENTS. IT IS FOR YOU TO DECIDE:

- 1. WHETHER THE DEFENDANT MADE ANY STATEMENT; AND
- 2. IF SO, HOW MUCH WEIGHT TO GIVE IT.

IN MAKING THOSE DECISIONS, YOU SHOULD CONSIDER ALL OF THE EVIDENCE ABOUT THE STATEMENT, INCLUDING THE CIRCUMSTANCES UNDER WHICH IT MAY HAVE BEEN MADE.

Case 1:07-cr-00019 Document 45 Filed 09/12/2007 Page 16 of 36

#### 14. TRIAL ON CHARGES IN THE INDICTMENT

THE DEFENDANT IS ON TRIAL ONLY FOR THE CRIMES CHARGED IN
THE INDICTMENT, NOT FOR ANY OTHER ACTIVITIES. YOUR DETERMINATION
MUST BE MADE ONLY FROM THE EVIDENCE IN THE CASE. YOU SHOULD
CONSIDER EVIDENCE ABOUT THE ACTS, STATEMENTS, AND INTENTIONS OF
OTHERS, OR EVIDENCE ABOUT OTHER ACTS OF THE DEFENDANT, ONLY AS
THEY RELATE TO THESE CHARGES AGAINST THIS DEFENDANT.

15. EVIDENCE: OTHER CRIMES

YOU HAVE HEARD EVIDENCE OF OTHER CRIMES, ACTS AND
WRONGDOINGS ENGAGED IN BY THE DEFENDANT BUT NOT CHARGED IN THIS
CASE. YOU MAY CONSIDER THAT EVIDENCE ONLY AS IT BEARS ON THE

DEFENDANT'S INTENT, PLAN, KNOWLEDGE, OR ABSENCE OF MISTAKE, AND

FOR NO OTHER PURPOSE.

THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED IN COUNT ONE OF THE INDICTMENT WITH CONSPIRING TO POSSESS WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE AND TO DISTRIBUTE A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE, IN VIOLATION OF SECTIONS 846, 841(a)(1) & 841(b)(1)(C) OF TITLE 21 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. IN ORDER FOR YOU TO FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF THAT CHARGE, THE GOVERNMENT MUST PROVE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT:

FIRST, BEGINNING ON OR ABOUT MAY 25, 2006, AND ENDING ON OR
ABOUT MAY 30, 2006, THERE WAS AN AGREEMENT BETWEEN TWO OR MORE
PERSONS TO COMMIT AT LEAST ONE CRIME AS CHARGED IN THE
INDICTMENT; AND

SECOND, THE DEFENDANT BECAME A MEMBER OF THE CONSPIRACY
KNOWING AT LEAST ONE OF ITS OBJECTS AND INTENDING TO HELP
ACCOMPLISH IT.

I SHALL DISCUSS WITH YOU BRIEFLY THE LAW RELATING TO EACH OF THESE ELEMENTS. A CONSPIRACY IS A KIND OF CRIMINAL PARTNERSHIP—AN AGREEMENT OF TWO OR MORE PERSONS TO COMMIT ONE OR MORE CRIMES. THE CRIME OF CONSPIRACY IS THE AGREEMENT TO DO SOMETHING UNLAWFUL; IT DOES NOT MATTER WHETHER THE CRIME AGREED UPON WAS COMMITTED.

FOR A CONSPIRACY TO HAVE EXISTED, IT IS NOT NECESSARY THAT
THE CONSPIRATORS MADE A FORMAL AGREEMENT OR THAT THEY AGREED

1 Off 2 TH 3 AC 4 FI 6 AI 7 Off 8 AC 9 10

ON EVERY DETAIL OF THE CONSPIRACY. IT IS NOT ENOUGH, HOWEVER,
THAT THEY SIMPLY MET, DISCUSSED MATTERS OF COMMON INTEREST,
ACTED IN SIMILAR WAYS, OR PERHAPS HELPED ONE ANOTHER. YOU MUST
FIND THAT THERE WAS A PLAN TO COMMIT AT LEAST ONE OF THE CRIMES
ALLEGED IN THE INDICTMENT AS AN OBJECT OF THE CONSPIRACY WITH ALL
OF YOU AGREEING AS TO THE PARTICULAR CRIME THAT THE CONSPIRATORS
AGREED TO COMMIT.

ONE BECOMES A MEMBER OF A CONSPIRACY BY WILLFULLY
PARTICIPATING IN THE UNLAWFUL PLAN WITH THE INTENT TO ADVANCE OR
FURTHER SOME OBJECT OR PURPOSE OF THE CONSPIRACY, EVEN THOUGH
THE PERSON DOES NOT HAVE FULL KNOWLEDGE OF ALL THE DETAILS OF
THE CONSPIRACY. FURTHERMORE, ONE WHO WILLFULLY JOINS AN
EXISTING CONSPIRACY IS AS RESPONSIBLE FOR IT AS THE ORIGINATORS. ON
THE OTHER HAND, ONE WHO HAS NO KNOWLEDGE OF A CONSPIRACY, BUT
HAPPENS TO ACT IN A WAY WHICH FURTHERS SOME OBJECT OR PURPOSE OF
THE CONSPIRACY, DOES NOT THEREBY BECOME A CONSPIRATOR.
SIMILARLY, A PERSON DOES NOT BECOME A CONSPIRATOR MERELY BY
ASSOCIATING WITH ONE OR MORE PERSONS WHO ARE CONSPIRATORS, NOR
MERELY BY KNOWING THAT A CONSPIRACY EXISTS.

# 17. <u>COUNT ONE--CONSPIRACY: DURATION AND NATURE OF PARTICIPATION</u>

A CONSPIRACY MAY CONTINUE FOR A LONG PERIOD OF TIME AND MAY INCLUDE THE PERFORMANCE OF MANY TRANSACTIONS. IT IS NOT NECESSARY THAT ALL MEMBERS OF THE CONSPIRACY JOIN AT THE SAME TIME, AND ONE MAY BECOME A MEMBER OF A CONSPIRACY WITHOUT FULL KNOWLEDGE OF ALL THE DETAILS OF THE UNLAWFUL SCHEME, OR OF THE NAMES, IDENTITIES, OR LOCATIONS OF ALL OF THE OTHER MEMBERS.

EVEN THOUGH A DEFENDANT MAY NOT HAVE DIRECTLY CONSPIRED
WITH THE OTHER CONSPIRATORS IN THE OVERALL SCHEME, THE
DEFENDANT HAS, IN EFFECT, AGREED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE CONSPIRACY
IF IT IS PROVED BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT:

FIRST, THE DEFENDANT DIRECTLY CONSPIRED WITH ONE
OR MORE CONSPIRATORS TO CARRY OUT AT LEAST ONE OF THE OBJECTS OF
THE CONSPIRACY; AND

SECOND, THE DEFENDANT KNEW OR HAD REASON TO KNOW THAT
OTHER CONSPIRATORS WERE INVOLVED WITH THOSE WITH WHOM THE
DEFENDANT DIRECTLY CONSPIRED.

IT IS NO DEFENSE THAT A PERSON'S PARTICIPATION IN A CONSPIRACY
WAS MINOR OR FOR A SHORT PERIOD OF TIME.

18. COUNT ONE--CONSPIRACY: AS CHARGED IN THE INDICTMENT
YOU MUST DECIDE WHETHER THE CONSPIRACY CHARGED IN THE
INDICTMENT EXISTED, AND, IF IT DID, WHO AT LEAST SOME OF ITS MEMBERS
WERE. IF YOU FIND THAT THE CONSPIRACY CHARGED DID NOT EXIST, THEN
YOU MUST RETURN A NOT GUILTY VERDICT ON THAT CHARGE, EVEN
THOUGH YOU MAY FIND THAT SOME OTHER CONSPIRACY EXISTED.
SIMILARLY, IF YOU FIND THAT THE DEFENDANT WAS NOT A MEMBER OF THE
CHARGED CONSPIRACY, THEN YOU MUST FIND THE DEFENDANT NOT GUILTY,
EVEN THOUGH THE DEFENDANT MAY HAVE BEEN A MEMBER OF SOME
OTHER CONSPIRACY.

Case 1:07-cr-00019	Document 45	Filed 09/12/2007	Page 22 of 36

1	19. <u>COUNT TWODISTRIBUTION: ELEMENTS OF THE OFFENSE</u>
2	THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED IN COUNT TWO OF THE INDICTMENT
3	WITH POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE AND DISTRIBUTION OF
5	METHAMPHETAMINE IN A FORM COMMONLY KNOWN AS "ICE", IN
6	VIOLATION OF SECTIONS 841(a)(1) AND 841(b)(1)(C) OF TITLE 21 OF THE UNITED
7	STATES CODE. IN ORDER FOR THE DEFENDANT TO BE FOUND GUILTY OF
8	THAT CHARGE, THE GOVERNMENT MUST PROVE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING
9	ELEMENTS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT:
10	

FIRST, THE DEFENDANT KNOWINGLY DELIVERED ICE; AND

SECOND, THE DEFENDANT KNEW THAT IT WAS ICE OR SOME OTHER

PROHIBITED DRUG.

20. <u>COUNT TWO-POSSESSION WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE:</u> <u>ELEMENTS OF</u> THE OFFENSE

THE DEFENDANT IS CHARGED IN COUNT TWO OF THE INDICTMENT
WITH POSSESSION OF METHAMPHETAMINE, IN A FORM COMMONLY KNOW
AS "ICE" WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE IN VIOLATION OF SECTION 841(a)(1) OF
TITLE 21 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE. IN ORDER FOR THE DEFENDANT TO
BE FOUND GUILTY OF THAT CHARGE, THE GOVERNMENT MUST PROVE EACH
OF THE FOLLOWING ELEMENTS BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT:

FIRST, THE DEFENDANT KNOWINGLY POSSESSED METHAMPHETAMINE,
IN A FORM COMMONLY KNOWN AS "ICE" IN A MEASURABLE OR DETECTABLE
AMOUNT; AND

SECOND, THE DEFENDANT POSSESSED IT WITH THE INTENT TO DELIVER IT TO ANOTHER PERSON. IT DOES NOT MATTER WHETHER THE DEFENDANT KNEW THAT THE SUBSTANCE WAS METHAMPHETAMINE. IT IS SUFFICIENT THAT THE DEFENDANT KNEW THAT IT WAS SOME KIND OF A PROHIBITED DRUG. TO "POSSESS WITH INTENT TO DISTRIBUTE" MEANS TO POSSESS WITH INTENT TO DELIVER OR TRANSFER POSSESSION OF A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE TO ANOTHER PERSON, WITH OR WITHOUT ANY FINANCIAL INTEREST IN THE TRANSACTION.

# 21. POSSESSION: DEFINITION

A PERSON HAS POSSESSION OF SOMETHING IF THE PERSON KNOWS OF ITS PRESENCE AND HAS PHYSICAL CONTROL OF IT, OR KNOWS OF ITS PRESENCE AND HAS THE POWER AND INTENTION TO CONTROL IT.

#### 22. KNOWINGLY: DEFINITION

AN ACT IS DONE KNOWINGLY IF THE DEFENDANT IS AWARE OF THE ACT AND DOES NOT ACT THROUGH IGNORANCE, MISTAKE, OR ACCIDENT.

THE GOVERNMENT IS NOT REQUIRED TO PROVE THAT THE DEFENDANT KNEW THAT HIS ACTS OR OMISSIONS WERE UNLAWFUL. YOU MAY CONSIDER EVIDENCE OF THE DEFENDANT'S WORDS, ACTS, OR OMISSIONS, ALONG WITH ALL THE OTHER EVIDENCE, IN DECIDING WHETHER THE DEFENDANT ACTED KNOWINGLY.

THE DEFENDANT MAY BE FOUND GUILTY OF DISTRIBUTING A

COMMIT THE ACT OR ACTS CONSTITUTING THE CRIME BUT AIDED AND

CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE EVEN IF THE DEFENDANT PERSONALLY DID NOT

ABETTED IN ITS COMMISSION. TO PROVE A DEFENDANT GUILTY OF AIDING

#### 23. <u>AIDING AND ABETTING: DEFINITION</u>

AND ABETTING, THE GOVERNMENT MUST PROVE BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT:

FIRST, DISTRIBUTING A CONTROLLED SUBSTANCE WAS COMMITTED BY SOMEONE;

SECOND, THE DEFENDANT KNOWINGLY AND INTENTIONALLY AIDED,
COUNSELED, COMMANDED, INDUCED OR PROCURED THAT PERSON TO
COMMIT THE OFFENSE; AND

THIRD, THE DEFENDANT ACTED BEFORE THE CRIME WAS COMPLETED.

IT IS NOT ENOUGH THAT THE DEFENDANT MERELY ASSOCIATED WITH

THE PERSON COMMITTING THE CRIME, OR UNKNOWINGLY OR

UNINTENTIONALLY DID THINGS THAT WERE HELPFUL TO THAT PERSON, OR

WAS PRESENT AT THE SCENE OF THE CRIME.

THE EVIDENCE MUST SHOW BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT THAT THE DEFENDANT ACTED WITH THE KNOWLEDGE AND INTENTION OF HELPING THAT PERSON COMMIT THE OFFENSE. THE GOVERNMENT IS NOT REQUIRED TO PROVE PRECISELY WHICH DEFENDANT ACTUALLY COMMITTED THE CRIME AND WHICH DEFENDANT AIDED AND ABETTED.

#### 24. MERE PRESENCE: DEFINITION

MERE PRESENCE AT THE SCENE OF A CRIME OR MERE KNOWLEDGE
THAT A CRIME IS BEING COMMITTED IS NOT SUFFICIENT TO ESTABLISH
THAT THE DEFENDANT COMMITTED THE CRIME, UNLESS YOU FIND THAT
THE DEFENDANT WAS A PARTICIPANT AND NOT MERELY A KNOWING
SPECTATOR. THE DEFENDANT'S PRESENCE MAY BE CONSIDERED BY THE
JURY ALONG WITH OTHER EVIDENCE IN THE CASE.

<b>25.</b>	TESTIMONY OF WITNESS INVOLVING SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES—
	IMMUNITY, BENEFITS, ACCOMPLICE, PLEA

YOU HAVE HEARD TESTIMONY FROM CARLOS TORRES, A WITNESS WHO HAS RECEIVED FAVORABLE TREATMENT FROM THE C.N.M.I.
GOVERNMENT FOR HIS COOPERATION IN CONNECTION WITH THIS CASE.

FOR THIS REASON, IN EVALUATING THE TESTIMONY OF CARLOS
TORRES, YOU SHOULD CONSIDER THE EXTENT TO WHICH OR WHETHER MR.
TORRES' TESTIMONY MAY HAVE BEEN INFLUENCED BY THIS FACTOR. IN
ADDITION, YOU SHOULD EXAMINE TESTIMONY OF MR. TORRES WITH
GREATER CAUTION THAN THAT OF OTHER WITNESSES.

26. TRANSCRIPTS

DURING THE TRIAL, YOU LISTENED TO AUDIO RECORDINGS THAT
WERE RECEIVED INTO EVIDENCE. YOU HAVE BEEN GIVEN A TRANSCRIPT OF
THE RECORDING TO HELP YOU IDENTIFY SPEAKERS AND AS A GUIDE TO
HELP YOU LISTEN TO THE TAPE. HOWEVER, BEAR IN MIND THAT THE TAPE
RECORDING IS THE EVIDENCE, NOT THE TRANSCRIPT. IF YOU HEAR
SOMETHING DIFFERENT FROM WHAT APPEARS IN THE TRANSCRIPT, WHAT
YOU HEAR IS CONTROLLING.

Case 1:07-cr-00019	Document 45	Filed 09/12/2007	Page 30 of 36

# 27. EACH COUNT A SEPARATE CRIME

A SEPARATE CRIME IS CHARGED AGAINST THE DEFENDANT IN EACH
COUNT. YOU MUST DECIDE THE CASE ON EACH CRIME CHARGED AGAINST
THE DEFENDANT SEPARATELY. YOUR VERDICT ON ANY COUNT SHOULD NOT
CONTROL YOUR VERDICT ON ANY OTHER COUNT.

ALL OF THE INSTRUCTIONS APPLY TO EACH COUNT UNLESS I INSTRUCT YOU OTHERWISE.

#### 28. CONDUCT OF DELIBERATIONS

WHEN YOU BEGIN YOUR DELIBERATIONS, YOU SHOULD ELECT ONE MEMBER OF THE JURY AS YOUR FOREPERSON. THAT PERSON WILL PRESIDE OVER THE DELIBERATIONS AND SPEAK FOR YOU HERE IN COURT. YOU WILL THEN DISCUSS THE CASE WITH YOUR FELLOW JURORS TO REACH AGREEMENT IF YOU CAN DO SO. YOUR VERDICT, WHETHER GUILTY OR NOT GUILTY, MUST BE UNANIMOUS.

EACH OF YOU MUST DECIDE THE CASE FOR YOURSELF, BUT YOU SHOULD DO SO ONLY AFTER YOU HAVE CONSIDERED ALL OF THE EVIDENCE, DISCUSSED IT FULLY WITH THE OTHER JURORS, AND LISTENED TO THE VIEWS OF YOUR FELLOW JURORS.

DO NOT BE AFRAID TO CHANGE YOUR OPINION IF THE DISCUSSION PERSUADES YOU THAT YOU SHOULD, BUT DO NOT COME TO A DECISION SIMPLY BECAUSE OTHER JURORS THINK IT IS RIGHT.

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU ATTEMPT TO REACH A UNANIMOUS

VERDICT BUT, OF COURSE, ONLY IF EACH OF YOU CAN DO SO AFTER HAVING

MADE YOUR OWN CONSCIENTIOUS DECISION. DO NOT CHANGE AN HONEST

BELIEF ABOUT THE WEIGHT AND EFFECT OF THE EVIDENCE SIMPLY TO

REACH A VERDICT.

Case 1:07-cr-00019 Document 45 Filed 09/12/2007 Page 32 of 36

## 29. **JUROR NOTES**

**DVERLY INFLUENCED BY THE NOTES.** 

SOME OF YOU HAVE TAKEN NOTES DURING THE TRIAL. WHETHER OR NOT YOU TOOK NOTES, YOU SHOULD RELY ON YOUR OWN MEMORY OF WHAT WAS SAID. NOTES ARE ONLY TO ASSIST YOUR MEMORY. YOU SHOULD NOT BE

1 /

## 30. <u>PUNISHMENT IRRELEVANT</u>

THE PUNISHMENT PROVIDED BY LAW FOR THIS CRIME IS FOR THE COURT TO DECIDE. YOU MAY NOT CONSIDER PUNISHMENT IN DECIDING WHETHER THE GOVERNMENT HAS PROVED ITS CASE AGAINST THE DEFENDANT BEYOND A REASONABLE DOUBT.

Case 1:07-cr-00019 Document 45 Filed 09/12/2007 Page 34 of 36

## 31. <u>BASIS OF VERDICT</u>

YOUR VERDICT MUST BE BASED SOLELY ON THE EVIDENCE AND ON
THE LAW AS I HAVE GIVEN IT TO YOU IN THESE INSTRUCTIONS. HOWEVER,
NOTHING THAT I HAVE SAID OR DONE IS INTENDED TO SUGGEST WHAT YOUR
VERDICT SHOULD BE—THAT IS ENTIRELY FOR YOU TO DECIDE.

- -

#### 32. <u>VERDICT FORM</u>

A VERDICT FORM HAS BEEN PREPARED FOR YOU. AFTER YOU HAVE REACHED UNANIMOUS AGREEMENT ON A VERDICT, YOUR FOREPERSON WILL FILL IN THE FORM THAT HAS BEEN GIVEN TO YOU, SIGN AND DATE IT, AND ADVISE THE BAILIFF THAT YOU ARE READY TO RETURN TO THE COURTROOM.

IF YOU FIND THE DEFENDANT GUILTY OF COUNT ONE AND/OR COUNT
TWO OF THE INDICTMENT, YOU ARE THEN TO DETERMINE THE NET WEIGHT
OF METHAMPHETAMINE FOR EACH CHARGE. YOUR DECISION AS TO THE
NET WEIGHT MUST BE UNANIMOUS AND MUST BE BEYOND A REASONABLE
DOUBT.

THE TERM "NET WEIGHT" MEANS THE WEIGHT OF THE
METHAMPHETAMINE WITHOUT ANY PACKAGING MATERIAL. THE
GOVERNMENT DOES NOT HAVE TO PROVE THAT THE DEFENDANT KNEW THE
EXACT QUANTITY OF METHAMPHETAMINE.

#### 33. **COMMUNICATION WITH THE COURT**

IF IT BECOMES NECESSARY DURING YOUR DELIBERATIONS TO
COMMUNICATE WITH ME, YOU MAY SEND A NOTE THROUGH THE BAILIFF,
SIGNED BY YOUR FOREPERSON OR BY ONE OR MORE MEMBERS OF THE JURY
NO MEMBER OF THE JURY SHOULD EVER ATTEMPT TO COMMUNICATE WITH
ME EXCEPT BY A SIGNED WRITING, AND I WILL RESPOND TO THE JURY
CONCERNING THE CASE ONLY IN WRITING, OR HERE IN OPEN COURT. IF YOU
SEND OUT A QUESTION, I WILL CONSULT WITH THE LAWYERS BEFORE
ANSWERING IT, WHICH MAY TAKE SOME TIME. YOU MAY CONTINUE YOUR
DELIBERATIONS WHILE WAITING FOR THE ANSWER TO ANY QUESTION.
REMEMBER THAT YOU ARE NOT TO TELL ANYONE—INCLUDING ME—HOW
THE JURY STANDS, NUMERICALLY OR OTHERWISE, ON THE
QUESTION OF THE GUILT OF THE DEFENDANT, UNTIL AFTER YOU HAVE
REACHED A UNANIMOUS VERDICT OR HAVE BEEN DISCHARGED.